

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION

ERNESTINE RENCHER,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Case No. 4:11CV1059 RWS
)	
LARRY WILLIAMS, as TREASURER OF)	
THE CITY OF ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before me on plaintiff's "motion to extend discovery/motion to compel defendant to provide reasonable discovery." The motion will be denied for several reasons. First, the motion contains no required certificate of compliance with Local Rule 3.04. Second, the motion is devoid of specifics as to the discovery sought to be compelled or plaintiff's entitlement to compel such discovery. As defendant correctly notes in his response to this motion, he has moved to quash certain discovery and is under no obligation to provide such discovery until so ordered by the Court. **Plaintiff's response to the May 14, 2012 Show Cause Order remains due on June 15, 2012 as previously ordered.** In addition, it appears that plaintiff served discovery upon defendant without giving defendant sufficient time to respond before the discovery cut-off period expired. Plaintiff did not obtain leave to extend the discovery cut-off deadline or shorten defendant's time to respond to the discovery, so defendant was under no obligation to respond to this discovery. Finally, the motion will be denied as unsupported by any appropriate factual or legal authority. **I caution plaintiff again that continued use of impertinent, scurrilous, and inflammatory remarks will not be tolerated and will result in**

the imposition of sanctions, which could include the dismissal of her action with prejudice.


Plaintiff's memorandum in support of her motion will be stricken from the record sua sponte.

See Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(f) (permitting the Court to strike any impertinent, scandalous or immaterial matter).

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion to extend discovery/motion to compel [#33] is denied.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff's memorandum in support of motion to extend discovery/motion to compel [#34] is stricken from the record.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Rodney W. Sippe", written in black ink.

RODNEY W. SIPPEL
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated this 13th day of June, 2012.